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Reviewer's report:

As stated previously, this is a very interesting research on the topic. The methodology is now clearer and the readability has improved. I look forward to seeing it published in this journal. Below are a few suggestions/clarifications that the authors may choose to consider.

I thank the authors for providing very good explanations in response to my point 1. Based on the clarification that the authors provided, I suggest to delete the sentence that names the three life story narrative approaches (authentic, substituted, and endorsed) on Page 5, lines 4 - 6, since it does not add anything more to the paper. These three are mentioned again on Page 16, lines lines 48- 49, which could be deleted as well.

I agree with the authors that it is logical to expect accuracy of decision prediction based on relationship. This is why I hoped that they would add a few sentences explaining this rationale of selecting relationship-pairs, even if there no study has done the same. This comparison is an added value of the study, although it is a secondary aim. Emphasizing on it in the conclusion would be useful.

The authors did not understand my comment regarding the country of study. Naturally, it is clear that they are from Saudi Arabia and thus it makes sense to do the study there. This is not what I meant. Studies in the field of medical ethics tend to be dominated by research carried out in Europe or North America. Thus, it is a welcome contribution to see work from other context. If the author names were blinded and the country was not specified, there is no reason to believe that this findings could be from any other country. Hence, my suggestion to explain why this context is relevant or irrelevant was to highlight why the context matters or not, in their opinions. As a reader I can imagine that its irrelevant because of the topic (end-of-life), its methodology and/or relationships that we all share irrespective of which society we live it. Also, an explanation to this would have intuitively made it evident why comparing this study with those from other context is valid. Stating that no such studies are carried out in Saudi Arabia would also to good for the readers.
Redundancies:

Page 16, paragraph 2: Part of the paragraph re-states what is said in the introduction about life story narrative model. This paragraph should be shortened to reduce redundancy, which will make the point of the paragraph clearer.

The first paragraph of the conclusion summarizes the main results and discussion. Although useful, is it necessary?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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